

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-43 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 19, 28, 31, 35, 37, 41, and 43 have been amended. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments, as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph [0025] of the Specification.

### **I. Rejections Over the Prior Art:**

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Applicant here only justifies the patentability of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 19, 31, 37 and 43). As the Examiner will appreciate, because these independent claims are patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims are also necessarily patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the patentability of the dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

All independent claims stand rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Special Edition, Using AutoCAD 2000 ("SE"). Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection. Specifically, SE does not disclose that the second (and third) magnification is adjustable by the user, or that when the second (or third) magnification is adjusted by the user, the adjusted magnification becomes a default magnification each time the corresponding portion is displayed, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, as amended, the claims allow a user working on a file to see a current view of the file at a first magnification, and then to zoom out from the first magnification to a second magnification (showing a larger second portion of the file). This second magnification is adjustable by the user. When the second magnification is adjusted by the user, the adjusted second

magnification becomes a default second magnification each time the second portion is displayed. The user may then zoom in on a third portion of the file, the magnification of which is also adjustable by the user. When the third magnification is adjusted by the user, the adjusted third magnification becomes a default third magnification each time the third portion is displayed.

The Examiner considers the Zoom Dynamic feature on page 3, paragraphs 3-5 and in Figure 11.3 of SE to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. However, the Zoom Dynamic option is simply used to “magnify a general area of the drawing that you want to work in” (SE, page 3, paragraph 3). In other words, Zoom Dynamic merely shows the current magnification window and a panning view box (i.e., the area to be magnified) in relation to the extents (i.e., the boundaries) of a drawing. Each of these areas has the same magnification every time Zoom Dynamic is used. While the panning view box may be moved to another area of a drawing and resized, the panning view box always represents the current zoom window magnification, or the magnification of the current window. Further, while the panning view box may be re-sized, SE clearly does not show or suggest that the extents of the drawing may be re-sized. Thus, SE merely discloses multiple areas, each area having a different size (but a constant magnification), on a display. Therefore, SE does not disclose that the second (and third) magnification is adjustable by the user, or that when the second (or third) magnification is adjusted by the user, the adjusted magnification becomes a default magnification each time the corresponding portion is displayed. Thus, the elements of SE are clearly not commensurate to the recited claim limitations of claim 1.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 (and the corresponding dependent claims) on the basis of SE cannot stand. Furthermore, while the remaining independent claims 19, 31, 37, and 43 use slightly different language, the above argument with respect to claim 1 is similarly applicable

to the language of these claims. Thus, claims 19, 31, 37, and 43 (and their dependent claims) are also not rejectable on the basis of SE.

\* \* \* \* \*

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-43 are allowable, and requests that a Notice of Allowance issue for these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

December 20, 2007  
Date

/Nathaniel Pettigrew/  
Nathaniel Pettigrew  
Reg. No. 59,007

**CUSTOMER NO. 29855**  
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,  
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P..  
20333 SH 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070  
832/446-2400  
832/446-2424 (facsimile)  
wcpatent@counselip.com